

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, the specification is amended, and claims 28 and 31 are amended, leaving claims 28-54 pending with claims 28 and 31 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 33-35, 37-47 and 49-54 contain allowable subject matter.

Drawing Objections

The drawings have been objected to because they do not include reference numerals mentioned in the description. Specifically, reference numeral 395c on page 89, line 9 of the specification does not appear in the drawings.

The specification has been amended to delete reference number 395c and therefore Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tateyama et al. (US 6,152,677).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 28 recites a component feeder for feeding wafer feed components and tray feed components to be mounted on a board from a wafer feeding plate comprising a plate placing device configured to selectively place and hold a wafer feeding plate and a tray feeding plate and allowing a wafer feed component and a tray feed component to be fed from the wafer feeding tray and the component feeding tray, respectively, the wafer feed component and the tray feed component being fed during different modes.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a component feeder. In particular, Tateyama discloses an apparatus and method of transferring substrates, such as semiconductor wafers or LCD (Liquid-Crystal Display) glass substrates, between the cassette and the processing section (cleaning section). See column 1 lines 5-8. Furthermore, the

unprocessed substrate is identical to the processed substrate, and has been only cleaned in the processing section. That is, Tateyama only discloses that the arms 21 hold a single type of substrate, in an unprocessed state and a processed state.

In contrast, in the present invention as recited in independent claim 28, it is clear that the wafer feeding plate is different from the tray feeding plate. That is, the wafer feed components are placed on the wafer feeding plate, and the tray feed components are placed on the tray feeding plate. *See Figs. 4 and 5.* Therefore, it is clear that Tateyama does not relate to the recited component feeder, and does not disclose a plate placing device configured to place and hold a wafer feeding plate and a tray feeding plate and allowing a wafer feed component and a tray feed component to be fed from the wafer feeding tray and the component feeding tray, respectively, the wafer feed component and the tray feed component being fed during different modes, as recited in independent claim 28.

Additionally, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Tateyama such that it would have rendered independent claim 28 obvious.

Moreover, as stated by the Examiner on Page 7 of the Office action, claims 28 and 31 originally claimed selectively placing and holding either the wafer feeding plate(s) or the tray feeding plate(s), and thus the Examiner merely needed to show that the prior art had a structure of performing one of these operations. Applicants submit that the claims as now pending require structure capable of selectively performing both of these operations. Specifically, claims 28 now recites a plate placing device configured to place and hold the wafer feeding plate and the tray feeding plate.

Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose a device having such a structure. Additionally, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Tateyama such that it would have rendered claim 28 obvious.

Therefore, Tateyama fails to disclose or render obvious independent claim 28 or its dependent claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 29-32, 36 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateyama in view of Moore (US 3,766,638).

Claims 29 and 30 are allowable for the reasons set forth above, since each of these claims is dependent from claim 28 and Moore fails to overcome the deficiencies of Tateyama.

Independent claim 31 and its dependent claims are allowable for similar reasons to those set forth above. Namely, claim 31 recites a component feeder comprising a plate receiving part for receiving a plurality of wafer feeding plates and a plurality of tray feeding plates while allowing the plates to be discharged, a plate placing device configured to place and hold a selected plate of the wafer feeding plates and the tray feeding plates and allowing the wafer feed component and the tray feed component to be fed from the wafer feeding tray and the component feeding tray, respectively, the wafer feed component and the tray feed component are fed during different modes.

The combination of Tateyama in view of Moore fails to render such a device obvious.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shoriki NARITA et al.

By _____
/Jeffrey J. Howell/
2009.11.03 13:37:16 -05'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell
Registration No. 46,402
Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 3, 2009